



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/852,848	05/11/2001	Kenneth Arneson	20-487	5684
7590	11/26/2008			
MANELLI DENISON & SELTIER PLLC			EXAMINER	
7th Floor			BARQADLE, YASIN M	
2000 M Street, N.W.				
Washington, DC 20036-3307			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2456	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/852,848	ARNESEN ET AL.
	Examiner YASIN M. BARQADLE	Art Unit 2456

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 7,8 and 26-33 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 7-8 and 26-33 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

Response to Amendment

2. The amendment filed on August 19, 2008 has been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive.

- Claims 1-6 and 9-25 have been cancelled.
- Claims 7-8, 26-27 and 30-31 are amended.
- Claims 7-8 and 26-33 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

Regarding claims 26, 28-30, 32 and 33, the Applicant argues "Chack fails to disclose associating a user-specific pre-designated information with call related information relating to a first device, much less using call related information to automatically retrieve the user-specific pre-designated information in response to a call from a first device without a need to answer the call from the first device, as recited by claims 26, 28-30, 32 and 33." (Page 6 first paragraph).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. For example, Chack teaches "In other embodiments of the invention, the transaction processing system identifies the telephone number or other identifier associated with a received call. Based on information known

about the call initiator, the transaction processing system determines whether to automatically provide a URL to the call initiator. For example, customers of an organization operating the transaction processing system may notify the organization that they have the capability to receive and utilize a URL. The organization maintains a table of such customers based on the customer's telephone number, account number, or other identifying information. If the transaction processing system receives a call from a customer listed in the table, then the transaction processing system automatically provides a URL to the customer." (col. 7, lines 9-22).

Chack further teaches "When the transaction processing system receives a request from a telephone caller for a URL (or otherwise determines that the caller can receive URLs), the transaction processing system may generate a custom web page for the caller having a unique URL. That URL is provided to the caller, thereby allowing the caller to view the custom web page on the caller's computer. The custom web page may contain, for example, information regarding the caller's account balance or information regarding pricing and availability of various products of interest to the caller." (col. 7, lines 40-49).

Therefore, Chack clearly teaches the argued limitation including providing user-specific pre-designated information with call related information relating to a first device (call initiator).

Chack also teaches A user-specific pre-designated information (such account balance and other information desired) is provided to a call initiator in response to a call without a need to answering said call from a first device (col. 7, lines 9-49 and col. 7, lines 61-65 and col. 8, lines 61-63).

Regarding claims 7 and 8, the Applicant argues "Makela fails to disclose a message that comprises caller specified pre-designated information, much less associating an email with a first phone number, the email comprising caller specified pre-designated information associated with call related information relating to a calling communications device, as recited by claims 7 and 8." Page 7 second paragraph.

The Applicant is directed to new rejection below necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

Regarding claims 7,8, 27 and 31, the Applicant argues "Chack and Pepe, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest associating user specific pre-designated information with call related information relating to a first

device, and using the call related information to automatically retrieve the user specific pre-designated information in response to a call from the first device without a need to answer the call from the first device, with the pre-designated information being transmitted in a short message, as recited by claims 27 and 31." See pages 8-9.

In response to above arguments, the Examiner notes the applicant is arguing against the references individually. However, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Pepe teaches providing a communication device (PDA 30) an email message. Chack is relied upon without answering a call providing desired information. Therefore, the combined references teach the argued limitation.

Regarding the elements of "associating user-specific pre-designated information with call related information relating to a first device", the examiner has addressed this issue how Chack meets this limitation. The Applicant is referred to the above response.

In regard to the use of short message by Pepe, the Examiner notes that Pepe disclose transmitting desired information in a short message (notification message) delivered via PDA and/or a pager device. See col. 5, lines 22-30 and col. 21, lines 40-52].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 26, 28-30 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chack USPN. (6751211).

As per claim 26, and 30 Chack teaches a method of retrieving information by a first device (Fig. 3, 60) from a second device (fig. 3, 68), comprising:

Receiving a call from a first device associated with a first telephone number at second device associated with a second telephone number (a telephone caller initiates a call to a telephone number associated with a transaction processing system col. 7, lines 61-63. See also col. 9, lines 43-46 and the abstract);

associating user specific pre-designated information with the call related information relating to said first device "When the transaction processing system receives a request from a telephone caller for a URL (or otherwise determines that the caller can receive URLs), the transaction processing system may generate a custom web page for the caller having a unique URL. That URL is provided to the caller, thereby allowing the caller to view the custom web page on the caller's computer. The custom web page may contain, for example, information regarding the caller's account balance or information regarding pricing and availability of various

products of interest to the caller" (col. 7, lines 9-49); using said call related information to automatically retrieve said user specific pre-designated information in response to said call 9(col. 7, lines 9-32) from said first device without a need to answering said call from said first device (the transaction processing system provides a URL to the telephone caller without answering the call col. 7, lines 61-65 and col. 8, lines 61-63); and

transmitting said retrieved user specific pre-designated desired information to said first device ("The transaction processing system provides a URL to the telephone caller. The web page associated with the URL contains information requested by the caller" (col. 7, lines 9-32 and col. 7, lines 61-65; col. 8, lines 61-63 and col. 9, lines 46-48).

As per claims 28 and 32 Chack teaches a method of retrieving information by a first device from a second device, further comprising:

determining said second telephone number from call related information associated with said call to said first telephone number by said first device [col.6, 11-18 and col. 8, lines 24-32].

As per claim 29 and 33, Chack teaches a method of retrieving information by a first device from a second device, wherein: said caller related information is caller ID [col.6, 11-18 and col. 8, lines 24-32].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 27 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chack USPN. (6751211) in view of Pepe et al USPN (5742668).

Regarding claims 27 and 31, although Chack shows substantial features of the claimed invention including transmitting retrieved user-specific pre-designated information to a telephone number as explained in claims 26 and 30 above, he does not explicitly show where the desired information is transmitted in a short message.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Chack, as evidenced by Pepe (5742668).

In analogous art, Pepe et al whose invention is about a network which provides a variety of electronic text delivery, receipt, and notification options system, disclose transmitting a desired information in a short message (notification message are delivered via PDA and/or a pager device. See col. 5, lines 22-30 and col. 21, lines 40-52]. Giving the teaching of Pepe et al, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and the advantage of modifying Chack by employing the system of Pepe et al in order to limit the messages sent to the wireless messaging equipment of a mobile employee by sending only urgent messages to devices of their choice that is capable of receiving desired short messages.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makela USPN. (6301338) in view of Chack USPN. (6751211).

As per claims 7 and 8, Makela teaches the method of providing electronic mail notification to a communications device (abstract), comprising:

associating an email with a first phone number, said email associated with call related information relating to said calling communications device (col. 3, lines 27-46 and col. 8, lines 30-36); and using call related information from said call to automatically identify (col. 5, lines 2-11) and provide said email to said communications device after said communications device calls a first phone number [col. 3, lines 27-46; col. 5, lines 31-36 and col. 8, lines 30-36].

Regarding claims 7 and 8, Makela shows substantial features of the claimed invention including sending SMS and/or an email message to caller's associated email address automatically (col. 3, lines 27-46 and col. 8, lines 30-36). However, Makela does not explicitly show where the message includes caller specified pre-designated information.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Makala, as evidenced by Chack.

In analogous art, Chack disclose "When the transaction processing system receives a request from a telephone caller for

a URL (or otherwise determines that the caller can receive URLs), the transaction processing system may generate a custom web page for the caller having a unique URL. That URL is provided to the caller, thereby allowing the caller to view the custom web page on the caller's computer. The custom web page may contain, for example, information regarding the caller's account balance or information regarding pricing and availability of various products of interest to the caller" (col. 7, lines 40-49). Giving the teaching of Chack a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and the advantage of modifying Makala by employing the system of Chack in order to provide identified calling customers immediately with information that is pertinent to their call.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pepe et al USPN (5742668) in view of Chack USPN. (6751211).

As per claim 7, Pepe et al teach the method of providing electronic mail notification to a communications device, comprising:

associating an email with a first phone number (the number called by the subscriber) receiving a call from a communications device (subscriber portable device 32) [col. 21, 15-67]; and using call related information from said call to automatically identify (col. 6, lines 47-65 and col. 21, lines 18-67] and provide said email to said communications device after said communications device calls a first phone number [col. 7, lines 30-46 and col. 21, lines 18-67].

Although Pepe et al shows substantial features of the claimed invention including providing emails to a communication device, he does not explicitly show transmitting desired information to a device without answering a call.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Pepe et al, as evidenced Chack USPN. (6751211).

In analogous art, Chack whose invention is about a method for communicating information discloses a transaction processing system that provides a desired information (a URL) to a telephone caller without answering the call (col. 7, lines 61-65 and col. 8, lines 61-63). Giving the teaching of Chack, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and the advantage of modifying Pepe et al by employing the method providing information to a telephone caller

without answering the call of Chack. One ordinary skill in the art would do so because the transaction processing system does not answer the incoming call therefore no connection charges are incurred since no connection was established.

As per claim 8, Pepe et al teach the method of providing electronic mail notification to a communications device according to claim 7, further comprising:

obtaining a communications device identifier when said communications device dials said first phone number, and using said communications device identifier to select said electronic mail message [col. 14, lines 46-63 and col. 21, 40-65].

Conclusion

ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened

statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yasin Barqadle whose telephone number is 571-272-3947. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Yasin M Barqadle/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2153